DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 180 075 EA 012 271

AUTHOR Gulyas, Paul A.
TITLE Improving the Behavior of Habitually Disruptive High School Students.
PUB DATE 26 Apr 79
NOTE 52p.: Revised Individual Practicum Report, Nova University

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Corporal Punishment; Discipline; *Discipline Problems; High School Students; *Program Descriptions; Program Evaluation; Senior High Schools; *Student Behavior; Suspension
IDENTIFIERS Thomas Jefferson High School PA

ABSTRACT

A means was developed to reduce the necessity for discipline among the 25 students who were the most chronic discipline problems at Thomas Jefferson High School, a 1,500-student school in suburban Pittsburgh. The students were identified by assigning point values to various disciplinary measures administered to students. The 25 students met with a vice-principal once each week for a minimum of five minutes to discuss any school problems, potential discipline problems they felt might arise, or recent discipline they had received. It was hoped that the talks would help prevent more serious problems or additional disciplinary measures. Weekly sessions were scheduled during each student's study hall. The student could arrange impromptu conferences if an immediate problem could not wait until the next scheduled session. Results of this "preventive maintenance" approach revealed that, compared with the same semester a year earlier, total suspension days were reduced 50 percent, instances of corporal punishment were reduced 24.1 percent, and detention hours were reduced 54 percent. (Author/IRT)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED180075

IMPROVING THE BEHAVIOR OF HABITUALLY DISRUPTIVE HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

S. Kelley

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BY

PAUL A. GULYAS

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of
the National Ed. D. Program for Educational Leaders,
Nova University.

Revised Individual Practicum Report
South Park Cluster
Submitted: April 26, 1979

Thomas Jefferson High School
Box 18019
Pittsburgh, PA 15236

EA 012 271

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Needs Analysis..... 1

Objectives..... 7

Review of the Literature..... 10

Strategy for Achieving Objectives..... 16

Evaluation..... 36

Conclusions and Recommendations..... 42

Bibliography..... 47

Appendix - Sample of Detention and Corporal Punishment Forms. 49

NEEDS ANALYSIS

Traditional methods of discipline sometimes seem to have little or no effect in modifying some high school students' behavior patterns. Indeed, most high schools have a small percentage of students (it depends upon the particular school and what the criteria for judgment are) who are considered "habitually disruptive," students "without healthy, normal inhibitions who will 'act out' against authority."[1] These same students are frequently in difficulty with teachers for various rules infractions, are frequently in the high school office to see a vice- or assistant principal about a rules infraction, and are frequently being disciplined as the result of their failure to abide by school regulations. "Such actions by students are extremely difficult to understand and to accept."[2] The mere fact that these kinds of pupils keep reappearing in offices of high schools virtually everywhere suggests that the measures (disciplinary or otherwise) taken to improve the behavior of these students are often not effective, and that a new strategy for dealing with the school's most chronic discipline problems is needed.

Thomas Jefferson High School, located in a suburb of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, houses grades nine through twelve with a student population of 1,500. Two vice-principals (one of whom is this report's author) split the discipline tasks for the entire student body with one vice-

---

[1] Gilbert R. Weldy, Principals: What They Do and Who They Are, Reston, Virginia, The National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1979, p. 21.

[2] Ibid.

principal handling ninth and tenth grades and the other (the author) handling eleventh and twelfth grades. Both vice-principals agreed that about two percent of the student body could be identified as being frequently in need of discipline. Forms of discipline used (from mildest to strongest) consist of a verbal reprimand, detention (one or more hours on consecutive nights after school in the high school office), corporal punishment (one to four strokes of the paddle), or suspension from school (one to ten days). The problems generated by having to frequently deal with students who habitually violate school regulations are these:

1. Students who have been disciplined for violating a school rule frequently violate the same rule again (hard data to provide exact figures are not available, but testimony from faculty members and administrators at Thomas Jefferson supports this claim strongly).
2. Students who have been sent to the office for discipline often miss one or more classes while waiting to see a vice-principal.
3. Students who receive detention as punishment sometimes fail to report for the detention and ultimately are summoned to the office again for further discipline (again, hard data are not available to provide exact numbers, but the two vice-principals agree that this happens at least twenty percent of the time).

4. The two high school vice-principals concur that on a typical school day, approximately seventy-five percent of the students they discipline could be termed "habitual" problems.

At Thomas Jefferson High School during the 1977-78 school year, 88 students were suspended at some time during the school year for a period of one to ten days. This represents about six percent of the total student body. Of these 88 pupils, 23 of them received more than one suspension during the year. The total number of school days that the 88 students spent out of the regular school setting for 1977-78 was 241, with the 23 repeaters accounting for 103 of the 241 days.

Regarding corporal punishment, 96 students at Thomas Jefferson were paddled during the 1977-78 school year (records are not kept as to how many strokes of the paddle each was given). Of these 96 pupils, 31 were recipients on more than one occasion.

Detention time totaling 1,691 hours was assigned during the 1977-78 school year to 363 pupils. Of those 363, 292 received detention on more than one occasion during the year; of those 292, 207 were assigned detention more than once for the same infraction of school regulations. Thus, while the use of detention is apparently helpful in modifying the behavior of some students, for the majority of students who receive detention, it is not conducive to altering their behavior (as evidenced by their repeated acquisition of additional detention time for committing the same offense after having already served detention time for this offense previously).

With the need for a new strategy to deal with the high school's habitually disruptive students thus confirmed and documented, the initial step in the practicum was to establish the group of twenty-five students who were the school's most habitual discipline problems. These twenty-five pupils were selected from grades eleven and twelve (the two grade levels handled by this report's author) and were identified using their discipline records from the 1977-78 school year. A point system was devised to determine which pupils would become part of the treatment group.

1. One point was awarded for each hour of detention assigned to each pupil who was in grade ten or eleven during 1977-78.
2. Two points were awarded for each instance of corporal punishment to each pupil who was in grade ten or eleven during 1977-78.
3. Three points were awarded for each instance of corporal punishment to each pupil who was in grade ten or eleven during 1977-78.
4. For each suspension of four or more days for a tenth or eleventh grade student during 1977-78, the number of points awarded corresponded to the number of days of suspension.

All students' points were then totaled, and the twenty-five students with the highest totals represented the twenty-five "habitual discipline problems" used in this project. The twenty-five pupils, to prevent identification and for reference purposes, were assigned identification numbers from one through twenty-five in decreasing order of points acquired, with pupil number one being the student who had accumulated the most points and number twenty-five the student who had accumulated the fewest.

The next step was to attempt to define reasonable improvement goals for each category (suspension, corporal punishment, detention) for each of the twenty-five members of the treatment group. These 75 sub-objectives were formulated by assessing types of regulations violated by each treatment group member and, where possible, assessing factors which might contribute to the more accurate determination of realistic improvement goals for the students in the project. Table I on the next page shows the point totals acquired by treatment group pupils during the first semester of 1977-78 in the areas of suspension, corporal punishment, and detention; it also shows the point totals expected of each student in these same categories during semester one of 1978-79 (the operational period of the project) and the reasons for those expectancies as they apply to each pupil in the treatment group.

TABLE I

Student Code #	POINTS ACQUIRED SEMESTER ONE 1977-78 Suspensions	Corporal Punishm't	Detentions	POINTS EXPECTED SEMESTER ONE 1978-79 Suspensions	Corporal Punishm't	Detentions	Reason for Expectancy
01	18	6	38	8	4	30	broken home; no home controls
02	3	2	52	3	0	32	frequently truant, detention given
03	13	0	42	10	0	30	parent opposes corporal punishm't
04	11	2	34	8	2	25	broken home; little self-control
05	8	4	30	6	2	25	pupil wants to drop out; admits it
06	6	2	32	3	2	16	lives with one grandparent
07	6	4	28	3	2	14	thinks teachers want to "get him"
08	0	2	34	0	0	16	runs away from home on occasion
09	13	2	21	3	0	10	habitually late to school, class
10	9	2	24	6	0	16	comes from broken home
11	3	2	28	1	0	7	parents committed to helping him
12	6	2	25	3	2	12	rebels against authority at times
13	8	4	20	3	2	10	argues, fights over trivia
14	3	2	25	0	0	10	admits wanting to improve self
15	3	2	24	3	2	16	broken home; little self-control
16	0	0	28	0	0	2	3 truancies accounted for 24 pts.
17	0	2	24	0	2	12	lives with foster parents
18	3	4	19	0	2	10	frequent class disrupter
19	8	2	16	0	0	8	lavatory use will be watched
20	0	2	23	0	0	5	parent now calls school weekly
21	0	4	21	0	2	10	one-parent family
22	5	2	16	0	0	8	needs frequent attention, praise
23	3	2	15	0	0	5	improved semester 2, 1977-78
24	0	0	18	0	0	6	sees problems; wants to improve
25	3	2	11	0	0	5	responds well to encouragement
	132	58	648	60	24	390	

OBJECTIVES

As a result of the assessment described in the Needs Analysis section of this report, three general objectives were formulated to correspond to the particular problems identified through determination of the high school's twenty-five most chronically disciplined students. The following probject goals were established:

1. Each of the twenty-five students who comprise the treatment group would reduce their total suspension points from the number acquired semester one of 1977-78 to the number expected for semester one of 1978-79 as displayed in columns two and five of Table I. The 132 total suspension days received by the twenty-five students would be reduced by 54 percent to 60 total days during the first semester of 1978-79 school year when measured against the number of suspension days received by this same group of twenty-five pupils during the first semester of the 1977-78 school year. This figure, 54 percent, was determined as the goal after the formulation of the twenty-five sub-objectives in Table I related to suspension (one objective for each student in the treatment group) by taking the total number of actual suspension points accumulated by the twenty-five students in the treatment group during the first semester of 1977-78 and comparing these points with the total points expected for suspensions among students in the treatment group during the first semester of 1978-79, the operational period of the project.

2. Each of the twenty-five students in the treatment group would reduce their total corporal punishment points from semester one of 1977-78 to the number expected for semester one of 1978-79 as displayed in columns three and six of Table I. The total points for corporal punishment acquired by the treatment group of twenty-five students would be reduced by 56 percent, from 58 points to 24, during the first semester of 1978-79 when measured against the incidence of corporal punishment received by this same group of twenty-five pupils during the first semester of 1977-78. This figure, 56 percent, was determined after the formulation of the twenty-five corporal punishment sub-objectives in Table I (one objective for each individual in the treatment group) by taking the total number of corporal punishment points accumulated by the twenty-five students in the treatment group during the first semester of 1977-78 and comparing these points with the total points expected for incidences of corporal punishment among the students in the treatment group during the first semester of 1978-79, the operational period of the project.
3. Each of the twenty-five pupils in the treatment group would reduce their total detention points from the number acquired semester one of 1977-78 to the number expected for semester one of 1978-79 as displayed in columns four and seven of Table I. The total number of detention hours assigned to the treatment group would be reduced by 48 percent, from 648 to 390 during semester one of 1978-79 when compared with semester one of 1977-78. This figure, 48 percent, was determined after the

formulation of the twenty-five detention sub-objectives displayed in Table I (one objective for each individual in the treatment group) by taking the total number of detention points accumulated by the twenty-five students in the treatment group during the first semester of 1977-78 and comparing these points with the total points expected for detention among these pupils during semester one of 1978-79, the operational period of the project.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

School administrators must fully appreciate that they are the custodians of delegated state authority that is clearly stated in the United States Constitution. Such responsibility must be treated with care. Principals should accept the limited notion of in loco parentis and refrain from exercising their authority over students in an arbitrary manner except when the safety and welfare of students are in jeopardy. Principals must become familiar with the constitutional limitations of their position and the rights of students. All school administrators should seek to establish procedural guidelines and follow these closely in every case of serious student infraction.[3]

Weldy, in his text Principals: What They Do and Who They Are, tends to agree that high school administrators must learn that their authority in the area of student discipline is not absolute. He notes that primarily because of court decisions during the 1960's and 1970's, schools have had to exercise greater discretion in penalizing students, particularly when the penalties deny students their right to an education, as in the case of suspension (or expulsion) from school.[4] In many states in years past, the principal had the final authority to suspend a student from school indefinitely. There was no requirement for any due process, hearings, or appeal. The student was at the absolute mercy of the principal. Now, however, principals no longer have

---

[3] W. Richard Brothers, "Procedural Due Process: What Is It?," NASSP Bulletin, January, 1975, p. 8.

[4] Weldy, op.cit., p. 55.

that authority making it necessary for alternative means of discipline to be employed except in the most severe cases. In most states before a student can now be suspended, the principal must be able to document the misbehavior (with dates, names, and descriptions of events), must be able to show all the efforts he has made or will make to provide educational alternatives for the student, and must show how the student and his family had been advised and warned of eventual consequences. In short, the Constitution protects students' rights in school just as it protects all citizens' rights in society at large. Corporal punishment, perhaps because of court challenges on its Constitutionality, is definitely used less in schools today. When it is used, it is administered under carefully controlled circumstances with adult witnesses. In spite of these limitations and restrictions, principals are expected to maintain an orderly, controlled atmosphere where learning can take place.[5]

Beyond the issue of legality and procedural due process is the question of the effectiveness of such long-standing punitive measures as suspension from school and corporal punishment. In Pennsylvania, the Commissioner of Education's 1976 Task Force on Student Responsibility and Discipline had this to say:

> Suspension from school has been, and continues to be, one of the most widely used disciplinary actions. Heavy reliance on this form of punishment persists in the face of mounting public concern and despite restrictions resulting from the student rights movement and court action.[6]

---

[5] Ibid., p. 56.

[6] The Pennsylvania Commissioner of Education's Task Force on Student Responsibility and Discipline, Guidelines for School Discipline, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania Department of Education, October, 1976, p. 8.

Regarding the use of suspension, "educators (specifically the 32-member Task Force made up of 22 administrators, six teachers, two counselors, and two school board members) appear to be in fundamental agreement on three points." First, they concur that this singular disciplinary response (suspension) is "probably oversued and often applied to situations where the seriousness of the misconduct does not merit putting the student out of school." Secondly, the educators generally affirm that this form of disciplinary action "has little impact on many students." Finally, evidence pointing to the repeated use of "suspension with the same students shows that it often fails to correct the misconduct to which it is being applied."[7]

Regarding the use of corporal punishment, educators are divided on their opinions of its effectiveness. The 1973 comprehensive study on the corporal punishment issue revealed that 61 percent of 2,000 secondary administrators agreed that "corporal punishment, properly used, is an effective way to make students behave in school" while 33 percent disagreed and 6 percent were undecided.[8] Corporal punishment means never having to say "I gave up on you too soon" to the few students who might benefit from it, according to David N. Thomas, Superintendent of Santa Barbara, California schools.[9] The debate rages on in 1979 with proponents on both sides still being heard.

---

[7] Ibid.

[8] "Corporal Punishment," NEA Research Bulletin, May, 1973, p. 49.

[9] "Spare the Rod and Spoil the Principal," Nation's Schools Report, Volume 5, No. 6, March 12, 1979, p. 1.

"Most civilized countries have done away with corporal punishment in the schools," says William F. Keough, superintendent of the schools for American dependents in Iran (from which he has recently fled). "In America," Keough continued, "schools are the only place where corporal punishment still exists with the laws approval," and he goes on to call use of the paddle a "premeditated punishment for something the child has done which is sometimes physically harmful and always harmful emotionally."[10] Thomas counters that it is precisely the "inner effect" which is sought in corporal punishment. To achieve it, he says, you ought to make "a ceremony of it." He explained that on busy mornings when he had to administer the paddle, he would keep the student waiting several hours as part of the effect of the overall punishment.[11] Keough's response to the ceremonial aspects of corporal punishment was that "the audio-visual department should be called in to video-tape" the event; playing it back later for the administrators participating would be enough for them to see the need for a viable alternative. Thomas replied as an administrator, he had administered corporal punishment only twice in his career, that the negative consequences of corporal punishment are less than the negative consequences of other choices such as suspension from

---

[10] Ibid.

[11] Ibid., p. 2.

school, and that in surveying the 23 principals in his district, only two of them had ever used corporal punishment but the majority wanted to have the option available.[12]

The debate of Keough and Thomas over the paddling issue is echoed by J. Lloyd Trump who attempts to suggest alternative means of handling disruptive students. "School teachers and other school officials are frustrated when they try to find solutions for problem students. The prescriptions to solve the discipline situations range from lowering the compulsory attendance age to providing early graduation from high school and beyond." Trump submits that a school for everyone does not apply simple solutions to complex problems, "nor does it expect old rules to apply to new games."[13] Implementing a specific prescription for each student, he notes, may involve changes in program as well as in the methods used. Thereafter, he suggets, systematic evaluation produces data for still more diagnoses, possibly some alternative prescriptive actions, and further follow-up in a cyclical pattern.[14]

Trump's recommendations do not exclude the need for discipline; no educators have suggested that discipline is not essential for learning to occur. John Luter, in Discipline, Democracy, and You, perhaps sums it up most concisely when he states, "Without discipline, there is little learning in the classroom. Ideally, students should know not only

---

[12] Ibid.

[13] J. Lloyd Trump, A School for Everyone, The National Association of Secondary School Principals, Reston, Virginia, 1977, p. 32.

[14] Ibid., p. 33.

right from wrong, but why right is right and why wrong is wrong. Why should I tell the truth? Why should I obey rules? Why should I respect the rights of others? When a student appreciates the reasons why these things are right or wrong, he is far more apt to do what is right."[15]

Indeed, the ultimate, unique achievement of good discipline is self-discipline. Carlos deZafra concurs in his text 62 Suggestions To Improve Classroom Discipline. deZafra notes that "experience tells us that not all groups or all individuals are likely to become completely self-disciplined within the school years, yet that is the goal toward which we must strive. Any philosophy of discipline which does not teach and instill the ideal of self-discipline within the group and the individual will eventually prove weak and ineffective."[16]

---

[15]John Luther, Discipline, Democracy and You, West Orange, New Jersey, The Economics Press, 1968, p. 13.

[16]Carlos deZafra, 62 Suggestions to Improve Classroom Discipline, West Orange, New Jersey, The Economics Press, 1968, p. 4.

STRATEGY FOR ACHIEVING OBJECTIVES

Armed with the literary documentation suggesting alternative means of handling discipline problems other than via corporal punishment and suspension, and given the statistical data gathered at Thomas Jefferson High School which demonstrated the relative ineffectiveness of these disciplinary measures, an innovative project referrred to as "preventive maintenance" provided a way at Thomas Jefferson during the first semester of 1978-79 to discourage improper behavior before it occurred rather than after it had happened. "Preventive maintenance" meant meeting each week for about five minutes individually with twenty-five students as "habitual discipline problems." The purpose of these meetings was to find out what kinds of problems the students were having in school, suggest to those pupils various types of behaviors designed to bring about positive relationships with peers and teachers, and to have these pupils avoid, through preventive maintenance, having to be disciplined for improper conduct or violations of school regulations.

Having identified the twenty-five students to participate in the project, as described in the Needs Analysis section of this report, the next step was to begin calling these pupils to the vice-principal's office individually for the purpose of explaining the project, its goals, and the methodology which was used in an attempt to meet those objectives. At the first session, which was held during the first week of the semester, each student in the treatment group was called from

study hall individually and told in a discussion-type setting, in essence, the following:

"_____ (blanks will indicate the use of student's first name), you know that last year you were a frequent discipline problem. You received X (student given the particular number that applies to him) hours of detention last year, and you received corporal punishment on X occasions, and were suspended from school X time(s), none of which, I'm sure, were enjoyable to you. This year, we are going to try and help you to avoid being in so much difficulty, and if you are willing to cooperate, we will try to significantly reduce the number of discipline situations in which you are involved this year. Are you willing? (Attempt was made at this point to secure commitment from pupil that he was willing to participate in the experiment). Okay, _____, here is what we are going to do. Once each week, you and I are just going to get together for a few minutes and talk about how things are going for you here at Thomas Jefferson. I want you to let me know about any problems you are having with teachers or other students, how your work is progressing in each of your classes, and how things are going outside of school as well, such as at home or at your part-time job if you have one. The whole idea, _____, is for us to try and foresee a possible problem that would result in you receiving some form of discipline before that problem occurs and then to take steps to prevent the problem from occurring, thereby eliminating the need for you to receive any discipline. How does that sound? (Here, a favorable response to the idea was secured before continuing). Now, _____, I realize that you may not go through the entire school year without ever receiving a detention from a teacher occasionally; however, during our little meeting each week, if you happen to have received detention from a teacher since the last time we met, we'll talk about it, try to figure out why it happened, hear what you have to say about it, and maybe attempt to come up with some ways to avoid that same situation in the future which resulted in you getting the detention. _____, let's arrange a time now that we can meet each week. When are your study halls? (A time agreeable to both student and vice-principal was decided upon, and the student was told that if he was absent on that particular day, he was to see me at the beginning of his first available study hall upon his return). There are just two other things I'd like you to know, _____. One is that you are not the only student who is going to be participating in this project, so if you hear other students or possibly even some of your friends discussing it, you will not be caught off guard. The other and perhaps more important thing is this: anything and everything that you tell me in our meeting each week will be absolutely confidential unless both of us agree that it should be otherwise. I know that in the past my relationship with you has usually been one of me being the disciplinarian and you being the recipient of the discipline, but I think you can see from what I have told you here today that if you and I work together, you should have a much better school year in terms of getting along with your teachers and with other students, and the result may even be that your grades will improve too.

This session then concluded with the scheduling of time each week for the st dent to meet with the vice-principal. In addition, the student was informed that if a problem arose that he felt he should discuss with the vice-principal immediately rather than waiting until the next regularly scheduled session, the student was to come to the office and inform the vice-principal's secretary of the need to see him as soon as possible. The secretary then had the names of those twenty-five students in the treatment group with instructions to set up an appointment for any student from that group as soon as possible (from the student's study hall, lunch period, or before or after school) unless it was possible for the vice-principal to meet with that student immediately.

Subsequent weekly sessions with each student in the group would include discussions of individual problems or potential problems the student was having. These problems were brought up by either the student or by the vice-principal, and various types of behaviors designed to resolve the problem and bring about positive relationships with peers and teachers were suggested, and a course of action acceptable to both the student and the vice-principal was implemented by the student.

Each student in the treatment group was accorded special, individualized help, and even though, for example, two students in the group might have had the same problem at various times during the project, the prescription for improvement suggested to the two students was based on the vice-principal's knowledge of the student and thus may not have been the same advice in both cases. Student #01 and student #11 offer a good example. Both students had received numerous deten-

tion hours in semester one of 1977-78 for tardiness to classes. When the same problem began to occur during the project's operational period (semester one of 1978-79), it was discussed with student #01 and student #11 in the weekly conference. Student #01 and the vice-principal recognized that the cause of the pupil being late and receiving detention was two-fold: one part of the problem stemmed from the fact that several of student #01's teachers permitted him to come to class late after the tardy bell had rung and did not penalize him for it while #01's other teachers demanded that he be there on time or be assigned detention; the other part of the problem was that #01 admittedly liked to stop in the lavatory between each class to socialize with friends or possibly to smoke (not permitted in school). After getting #01 to also admit that he (#01) was aware that getting caught smoking results in corporal punishment or suspension and that he realized he should not be smoking in school, the vice-principal and #01 worked out an agreement whereby #01 agreed not to stop in the lavatory more than twice daily unless he secured approval from the vice-principal. In addition, #01 agreed not to make either of his two daily lavatory stops before any of the classes where he had teachers who demanded that he be in class on time or receive detention. Although #01 admittedly broke the agreement on several subsequent occasions during the semester, there was noticeable improvement in his on-time-to-class record which the vice-principal learned from a verbal check with #01's teachers periodically.

Student #11, like #01, also began to acquire detention hours during the first semester of 1978-79 for tardiness to class, and the vice-principal brought it up in the weekly conference as soon as it became apparent.

Student #11's reason for being late to classes, however, differed considerably from #01's, and herein lies the value of the individual conference with a prescription for improvement tailored to the individual needs of the student. Student #11 admitted that he was late for many classes because he had a girlfriend in school whom he walked to all but one of her classes on a daily basis; he also admitted that he would sometimes talk to his girlfriend at her classroom door after having walked her there and would not leave for his own classroom until the tardy bell had rung. Knowing that #11 would not abandon the idea of walking his girlfriend to class, the vice-principal asked #11 to write down the room locations of all of his classes and of all his girlfriend's classes. They then worked out an arrangement whereby at several times during the day, #11's girlfriend would walk #11 to his class rather than vice-versa, and #11 agreed that they would not talk outside either's classroom after arriving there if they had less than one minute remaining until the tardy bell rang. Although this last part of the agreement was sometimes violated by #11's own admission, #11's detentions for coming to classes late did decrease after working out this arrangement, and his girlfriend did not increase her detention assignments (#11 later mentioned that he "really tried hard" to make this work because the time had been taken to look at both his and his girlfriend's schedule in an attempt to reduce detentions received while still permitting the two pupils to see each other between classes).

Student #02's biggest problem in semester one of 1977-78 was truancy from school. In fact, 48 of #02's 52 hours of detention that semester were make-up hours in detention for illegal absences (truancies). At Thomas

Jefferson, a truancy results in eight hours of detention time on eight consecutive nights after school. Student #02 admitted to the vice-principal in the first conference during the project that she really did not like to skip school but said that while she had been caught on about six occasions during semester one of 1977-78, there were actually many more days than that when she had been truant but had not been caught. Further discussion revealed that #02 had not been caught because she chose days to be truant when her parents would not be at home; and thus when the attendance clerk (who calls home daily on all absent students) called, either nobody was at #02's home, or #02 herself would answer the phone and tell the attendance clerk she was ill. Admittedly, #02 then would write her own excuse for the absence and forge her mother's signature. The six times she got caught occurred when the attendance clerk either made a follow-up phone call the next day and found that #02's mother had not known she had been absent the previous day or when the attendance clerk had checked the written excuse from #02 and found the writing did not match with other legitimate written excuses from #02's mother. The vice-principal and #02 agreed that being truant from school really was not going to help #02 get an education which she admittedly wanted and that if a prospective employer saw her record of truancy he might be reluctant to hire her out of fear that she might be frequently absent from work. The important aspect of behavioral improvement in many instances in the treatment group was getting the student to recognize the problem and admit that it needed to be corrected through action involving the student, a parent, or sometimes both. In #02's situa-

tion, a solution to the problem was found involving her parents. It was agreed that during the project's operation period (semester one of 1978-79), anytime that #02 was going to be legitimately absent from school, one of her parents would telephone the school the morning of the absence to confirm it in addition to writing the regular excuse for #02 to bring back with her when she returned. It should be pointed out that before #02's parents were notified of this arrangement, #02 had to agree to it; otherwise, the rapport between #02 and the vice-principal would have diminished and the subsequent weekly conferences may have been viewed by #02 as an adversary relationship, thereby destroying the hope of eliminating any other problems involving #02 where her cooperation was essential. The parents of #02 were very receptive to this idea for preventing truancy, and although #02 was truant once during the project after this arrangement was implemented, it was on a day known as "junior skip day" where many eleventh grade students had quietly planned an outing in advance catching school officials off-guard; #02 apologized for this one violation of the agreement, served her eight hours of detention willingly, and agreed that it would not reoccur.

Student #03's biggest problem was being a class disrupter. He was frequently assigned detention for various types of disruption (talking to others, arriving late to class, sitting in seats other than ones to which he had been assigned, back-talk to teachers, etc.). Each week, #03 and the vice-principal would attempt to take just one of these types of disruption and seek causes and a solution for it. Students #03, #12, #15, and #17 were all similar in this regard. However,

each of these four pupils had difficulty achieving expected goals in reducing the number of detention hours assigned to them by teachers during the project. Student #03, for example, came from a family which objected to corporal punishment (parents who put this in writing eliminate corporal punishment for their children as a penalty by School Board policy). Student #03 was aware, of course, that he could not be paddled for classroom misbehavior (or for any reason), and he made it clear in one of our earliest conferences that his behavior would probably be better if he were paddled because he admittedly deserved it. The result was that #03's behavior tended to be best for the several days immediately following the weekly conference but would tend to deteriorate after that. An effort by the vice-principal to get #03's parents to rescind their corporal punishment ban was futile despite #03 himself telling his parents on the phone in the vice-principal's office during a conference that he would rather be paddled than suspended from school for his repeated classroom misconduct.

Student #04, also a classroom disrupter, had a problem getting along with his peers. He would frequently argue with other students in class and had been previously suspended on three occasions during 1977-78 for fighting. He admitted that he comes from a broken home, that his brothers frequently fight with each other or with peers, and that he sees fighting as a way to settle differences. He also admitted that he knows that fighting in school gets him into trouble but he knew of no other solution when situations became confrontations. The vice-principal and #04 centered many conferences on which students he saw as adversaries, and #04 was one of several in the treatment group who would schedule a

special impromptu conference with the vice-principal if he (#04) was able to anticipate having a fight with another student. The vice-principal would ask #04 to describe the problem from the first point at which #04 was able to remember a verbal conflict between himself and the other student. Student #04 was then asked to explain in detail the circumstances surrounding the pending fight. At that point, the vice-principal and #04 would agree on some plan to avoid the fight. The most frequent course of action would be for #04 to agree not to speak to the other student under any circumstances, including if the other student spoke to #04, unless #04 had received approval from the vice-principal to do so. This technique was successful in preventing at least three in-school fights involving #04 during the project's operational period (but #04 found it necessary to have one of three fights anyhow on a Saturday). One other fight which #04 admitted would take place in school the first time he (#04) saw the other student in school was quelled by having #04 and the other student discuss the situation in the vice-principal's office and having both students give their word that if after talking things over a fight still was necessary to "solve" the differences that the fight would take place off of school grounds during non-school hours (the fight, according to #04, took place that evening).

Student #05, a female, was also a frequent class dirupter and class cutter during the first semester of 1977-78. In our initial conference, she had indicated that she would be dropping out of school within two weeks because she would be seventeen years of age (the age in Pennsylvania when students are no longer legally required to attend school and may withdraw with or without parental approval). In spite

of an effort by the vice-principal to convince the student to remain at Thomas Jefferson for at least the first semester of the 1978-79 school year, the student withdrew on her seventeenth birthday citing previously made plans and a full-time job as a waitress as reasons for her decision.

Student #06 was a frequent class disrupter also during the first semester of 1977-78. The vice-principal, in checking his past records, discovered that unlike many of the other students in the treatment group who were class disrupters, #06 had above-average grades and a desire to maintain these marks. Initial conference sessions elicited from #06 that he felt unchallenged by much of the routine classwork and assignments and that his disruptive behavior occurred often during time in class when students were to be working on assignments. According to #06, he would often be able to finish assignments quickly (and accurately), and rather than initiate some worthwhile academic activity on his own during the time remaining in these situations, #06 would begin to disturb other students and create a disruptive classroom atmosphere; a check with several of #06's teachers from semester one of 1977-78 revealed that indeed, this was often the case. The vice-principal and #06 agreed that the vice-principal would talk to #06's academic teachers and see if #06 could not be given additional assignments for extra credit providing his regular assignments were properly completed. This solution resulted in #06 accumulating fewer detentions than even originally expected, and although #06 still occasionally was disruptive, one teacher who had taught #06 during semester one of both school years (1977-78 and 1978-79) said that

his classroom behavior had improved considerably since the extra-credit techqnique had been implemented.

Student #07, another class disrupter and frequent late arriver to classes, indicated in an early conference that he felt teachers were "out to get me." The student and vice-principal spent the first five sessions discussing why #07 felt that way, and the vice-principal began to realize that #07 repeatedly referred to situations where #07 had admittedly done something wrong in school and received punishment for it while also referrring to situations where other students had also violated the same regulation as #07 yet had escaped punishment. The student and vice-principal focused on two areas which #07 often mentioned. The first was that #07 claimed he had received corporal punishment for smoking in the lavatory between class periods by a teacher who did not give corporal punishment to other students in that same lavatory when #07 was apprehended. The vice-principal asked #07 if #07 had reported the names of any of the other students who were also smoking to the teacher who had paddled him, and he said that he had not, citing the desire not to be a "narc" (student term for one who reports the wrongdoings of others). In checking with the teacher in question, the vice-principal learned that while, according to the teacher, there probably had been other students smoking in that lavatory at the time #07 was caught, #07 was the only one the teacher actually saw with a cigarette and therefore did not punish anyone else because of his uncertainty about which other students were smoking. When the vice-principal discussed this with #07 in a subsequent conference, #07 admitted that he would not want

to be punished for something he did not actually do, nor would he want to be punished for something he did do wrong by someone who really was not positive of #07's involvement in the wrongdoing. Subsequent discussions with #07 by the vice-principal reinforced this idea, and eventually the vice-principal detected that #07's attitude about teachers being "out to get him" had been modified, and that although #07 still violated school regulations at times, he tended to accept his penalty more readily and to place the blame upon himself for his actions.

Student #08 accumulated 32 of his 34 points during the first semester of 1977-78 because on four occasions, he had "run away from home" over weekends and returned on Monday evenings (according to his parent), and his truancies from school resulted in 32 hours of detention. The student indicated in an early conference that these run-aways would not reoccur during 1978-79 because the problem (#08's girlfriend lived in Ohio and he had gone there on the weekends he had "run away") no longer existed since #08 was now dating someone else. Subsequent weekly conferences with #08 were primarily to have him assure the vice-principal that no immediate "run-aways" were anticipated. It should be noted that #08 was truant for two days during semester one of 1978-79 and made up 16 hours of detention as a result, but this occurred because #08's father had approved a fishing trip for #08 without the school's knowledge or approval, and according to #08 (and confirmed by his father), the trip was an impromptu arrangement one day when #08 came from school. Thus, according to #08, he could not have not informed the vice-principal of this ahead of time. The vice-principal did review the situation by telephone with #08's father, stressing the need for #08 not to revert to

being illegally absent from school as he had previously in the run-away situations. The father of #08 agreed that this would not happen, and #08 finished the first semester of 1978-79 without any further violations of school attendance requirements.

Student #09's use of marijuana in school during semester one of 1977-78 resulted in a ten-day suspension at that time; his frequent tardiness to class also resulted in numerous hours of detention assigned during that same semester. In one of the early conferences between #09 and the vice-principal, #09 assured the vice-principal that he had not brought marijuana to school since the 1977-78 suspension because he realized that another violation would result in a School Board hearing for possible expulsion (#09 admitted to the vice-principal that he still used marijuana but "never" in school). Thus, conferences with #09 focused on the fact that he still arrived late for many classes again during semester one of 1978-79. The student admitted being in the lavatory between most classes and subsequently arriving late to classes as a result. The vice-principal and #09 reached an agreement whereby #09 would use the lavatory no more than twice daily unless he secured administrative approval. This solution worked well for a while, but #09 occasionally violated it by his own admission and received additional detentions for tardiness to class. At this point, the vice-principal and #09 agreed that the next detention #09 received for tardiness to class, no matter what the reason, would result in #09 being restricted to using only the lavatory in the nurse's office (where he could not socialize with friends) for a period of one week. This system remained

operative for the remainder of the semester and was helpful in reducing #09's between-class visits to the regular lavatory and in reducing the number of times tardy to class.

Student #10, similar to #02, was an attendance problem. Both of #10's parents worked during the day, and on more occasions than school officials were probably able to determine, #10 would be absent from school and return with a written excuse indicating illness as the reason which had been written by #10 and not by one of his parents. The solution which the vice-principal and #10 agreed would be implemented would be to have one of his parents telephone the school any day that #10 was going to be legitimately absent from school. This worked very well, except for one occasion where #10 admittedly phoned the school one morning pretending to be his father; the voice difference was detected by the attendance clerk who received the call and informed the vice-principal of the situation. The vice-principal then telephoned #10's father at work, and the father confirmed that #10 should have been in school and that he (the father) had not telephoned the school. Student #10 had no other attendance problems during semester one of 1978-79.

Student #11 was another frequent class disrupter, often arrived late to classes, and often failed to follow teacher directives; most of these offenses resulted in numerous detentions being assigned to him during semester one of 1977-78. Ironically, the solution which resulted in #11 being the most improved student in the entire treatment group emerged from a phone call from #11's father wanting to know more about this experimental project which #11 had mentioned at home.

The father of #11, after hearing how the program would operate, was exceptionally supportive, and he suggested that the vice-principal telephone him on every occasion that #11 received even a minor penalty, such as detention. When the vice-princpal reviewed with the father the discipline record of #11 for semester one of 1977-78, the father said he had not been aware of any of the 28 hours of detention #11 had served (parents are not notified when students receive detention primarily because of the time that would be involved in such a massive undertaking). The vice-principal then reminded #11's father that part of the project's method of operation was to secure the student's agreement with any attempted solution so that the student would feel that he and the vice-principal were working together rather than as adversaries. The next step was for the vice-principal to obtain #11's agreement that with #11, the vice-principal, and #11's father all working together to try to help #11 avoid discipline situations #11's school year should be more rewarding to him. After several conference sessions, #11 agreed that the vice-principal and #11 would be present in a conference session anytime there was need to inform #11's father of a discipline situation. The result was a decrease from 28 detention hours during semester one of 1977-78 to 5 hours during semester one of 1978-79 (see p. 20 for additional details about student #11).

Student #12 was another frequent class disrupter who often talked back to teachers who assigned him detention for his behavior; this often had resulted in additional punishment for his belligerence to the teacher after having been assigned detention or having been verbally

reprimanded. Student #12 admitted to the vice-principal that this pattern of behavior was unacceptable and that he (#12) usually regretted having magnified a minor problem by his belligerence to the teacher who had reprimanded him. Student #12 and the vice-principal agreed that the major problem they would try to resolve would be #12's reaction and responses in those situations where a teacher had reprimanded him or penalized him. After several conferences in which #12 and the vice-principal discussed the kinds of reactions and responses which would be acceptable, #12 agreed that if he were reprimanded or penalized by a teacher, he would not talk back to that teacher or do anything to compound the problem; rather, #12 agreed to come and see the vice-principal as soon as possible after having been reprimanded or penalized to discuss the situation (but #12 could not simply get up and leave a class without permission if such a situation arose during a class period). This solution proved to be relatively effective in reducing #12's previous propensity for compounding small problems into larger ones. His disruptive behavior also tended to decrease as a result.

Student #13's disruptive behavior centered on conflicts with other students which often took the form of verbal confrontations and occasional fights. Conferences between #13 and the vice-principal revealed a similarity to student #4 in most respects, and solutions which #13 agreed to implement were structured similarly to those used with student #4 (see pp. 23-24).

Student #14 acquired 25 hours of detention during semester one of 1977-78, and 20 of these were for tardiness to classes. In our second

conference, #14 told the vice-principal of his desire to be a better student both in academic achievement and in behavior for 1978-79. He acknowledged that his frequent tardiness was caused by him going into the lavatory between most classes to smoke, but he said that during the summer of 1978 he had quit smoking, and that he would not be stopping in the lavatories this year between classes except when necessary. Weekly conferences with the vice-principal were primarily used to verbally encourage #14 to continue to be on time for classes and to discuss those several instances of tardiness which did result in detention being assigned to him.

Student #15 in 1977-78 was a frequent class disrupter, was often late to classes, caused problems in study halls, carried cigarettes openly in shirt pocket (contrary to School Board policy) and admittedly smoked them between classes in lavatories, and expressed a desire to drop out of school at age seventeen (during second semester of 1978-79). During the third week of school, #15 was suspended from school for three days and failed to come to the next several weekly conferences with the vice-principal. When the vice-principal questioned #15 about his absence from the conferences, #15 told the vice-principal he no longer wanted to participate in the weekly sessions. The vice-principal asked #15 to attend just one more conference to discuss his withdrawal from the treatment group, which #15 agreed to do. At that session, #15 told the vice-principal that he just did not want to come in any longer for conferences, and in spite of efforts by the vice-principal to determine the cause of this (including asking #15 if it was because he had been recently suspended for smoking to which #15 had indicated it was not), #15 maintained his desire to terminate the weekly conferences. The

vice-princpal indicated to #15 that he would like to call #15's mother to discuss the matter further, and #15 agreed that this would be acceptable but that it would not change his mind about withdrawing from the weekly sessions. The phone call to #15's mother did not reveal the reason for #15's decision either (she reiterated to the vice-principal that she had little control over #15's activities at home or in school and little knowledge of his reasons for saying or doing things). At that point, the vice-principal told #15 that he would not be required to attend any further weekly conference sessions but that 15's scheduled time slot would be held open for him should he wish at any point to resume the conferences. The vice-principal also told #15 that he should feel free to schedule an impromptu conference with the vice-principal at any time he felt it necessary and that the vice-principal would be checking with him in several weeks on an informal basis to schedule a conference if a need for one seemed to exist. Student #15 never formally rejoined the treatment group after that but occasionally would talk casually in the hall with the vice-principal in a general way which did not include specific personal or school problems that #15 may have been encountering. The vice-principal did, as a result, alert #15's counselor to the situation and asked the counselor to attempt to talk with #15 about his school-related disciplinary problems.

Student #16, similar to students #02 and #10, was an attendance problem who had been truant from school on at least three occasions during the 1977-78 first semester. The vice-principal and #16 agreed, as in the cases of #02 and #10, that #16's parent would have to call the school any morning that #16 was going to be absent from school in

addition to writing the required excuse for #16 to bring back upon return from the absence. The parent of #16 was wholly supportive of this approach, and #16 was truant from school only, like #02, once during semester one of 1978-79, on "junior skip day."

Students #17 through #25 exhibited various problems which have already been addressed in the discussion of students #01 through #16. The solutions reached between students #17 through #25 and the vice-principal have also been ones implemented with students #01 through #16, and therefore a review of the specifics for students #17 through #25 would be redundant. In summary, the important aspect of the strategy is that the student's approval and acceptance of tentative solutions to problems must be obtained before an attempt is made to implement the strategy. Simply "telling" a student what actions he must take to alleviate school problems is not sufficient; the solution must come from a joint agreement between the administrator and the student that both feel would have likelihood of success. To do otherwise is to destroy the cooperative spirit which must exist between the student and the vice-principal and may lead to a reluctance on the part of the student to discuss those problems which should emerge in the weekly conference.

Finally, it should be noted that while conferences were scheduled to last only five minutes, the vice-principal allowed up to fifteen for each conference if necessary, and longer if his schedule permitted it or the needs of an individual student required it. The vice-principal's responsibilities in the project itself included the planning, organization, development, implementation, and evaluation of it, including but not limited to:

1. Needs assessment conferences with other administrators and teachers in the building.

2. Gathering of statistical data to support the need for the project and for this report.

3. Research and review of the literature pertinent to this project.

4. Formulation of objectives to be accomplished by this project.

5. Identification of the school's most frequently disciplined students.

6. Development of strategies for achieving project objectives.

7. Arranging and conducting twenty-five or more weekly meetings with the students in the project's treatment group.

8. Data analyses during and after the project of the students in the treatment group with regard to type and amount of discipline received (process and product evaluation).

9. Incorporation of minor modifications in the "preventive maintenance" program as needed to better achieve practicum goals.

10. Collection and maintenance of all discipline records and anecdotal notes on the twenty-five students during the course of the project.

11. Conferences with other administrators and teachers in the school as process evaluation of the project.

12. Evaluation of the "preventive maintenance" program through statistical analyses, through oral and written teacher and administrator input, and through an evaluation of the practicum.

13. Formulating conclusions and recommendations as a result of examining the evaluative data collected and assimilated during the project.

14. Follow-up work to determine if the project should be abandoned for 1979-80, continued for 1979-80 as it exists, or continued in 1979-80 with modifications implemented to improve its effectiveness.

EVALUATION

Evaluation was conducted in three ways: (1) evaluation of the preventive maintenance program through statistical analysis; (2) evaluation of the program through oral and written student, teacher, and administrator input; and, (3) evaluation of the practicum itself.

Analysis

1. The first of three goals of the practicum was to reduce the total number of suspension days received by the twenty-five students identified as "habitual discipline problems" (treatment group) by 54 percent during the first semester of the 1978-79 school year when measured against the number of suspension days received by this same group of twenty-five students during the first semester of the 1977-78 school year. During the first semester of 1977-78, the treatment group amassed a total of 132 suspension days; during the first semester of 1978-79, the treatment group acquired 66 total suspension days. Thus, the total number of suspension days was reduced by 50 percent, or by 4 percent less than the objective. (It should be noted that by the end of the practicum's operational period, the treatment group had been reduced to 23 students from 25; one pupil dropped out of school upon reaching the required voluntary withdrawal age of 17, and another pupil in the treatment group moved from the school district shortly after the practicum's inception).

2. The second goal of the practicum was to reduce the total number of instances of corporal punishment received by members of the

treatment group by 56 percent during the first semester of the 1978-79 school year when measured against the number of instances of corporal punishment received by the same group during the first semester of 1977-78. In semester one of 1977-78, the treatment group acquired 58 points (29 instances of corporal punishment); in semester one 1978-79 (the practicum's operational period), the treatment group acquired 44 points (22 instances of corporal punishment). The total number of corporal punishment instances was reduced by 24.1% (see Table II, page 38 for comparative data).

3. The final goal of the practicum was to reduce the total number of detention hours acquired by the treatment group during the first semester of 1978-79 by 48 percent when measured against the total number of detention hours the group acquired during the first semester of the 1977-78 school year. In semester one of 1977-78, the treatment group received a total of 648 hours of detention; in semester one of 1978-79, the group acquired a total of 298 detention hours. Thus, the total number of detention hours was reduced by 54 percent, and this practicum goal was achieved (see Table II, page 38 for comparative data).

Oral and Written Personnel Input

Additional analyses were made made by administrators in the building, teachers of students in the treatment group, the treatment group itself, and the author of this report.

1. Administrators from the building conferred bi-weekly on a collective basis to discuss the "preventive maintenance" program. All admini-

TABLE II

Student Code #	POINTS ACQUIRED SEMESTER ONE 1977-78			POINTS EXPECTED SEMESTER ONE 1978-79			POINTS ACQUIRED SEMESTER ONE 1978-79		
	Suspensions	Corporal Punishm't	Detentions	Suspensions	Corporal Punishm't	Detentions	Suspensions	Corporal Punishm't	Detentions
01	18	6	38	8	4	30	12	4	26
02	3	2	52	3	0	32	5	2	21
03	13	0	42	10	0	30	8	0	26
04	11	2	34	8	2	25	6	4	17
05	8	4	30	6	2	25	dropped out of school		
06	6	2	32	3	2	16	0	4	14
07	6	4	28	3	2	14	3	4	15
08	0	2	34	0	0	16	3	0	12
09	13	2	21	3	0	10	3	2	16
10	9	2	24	6	0	16	3	2	12
11	3	2	28	1	0	7	0	0	5
12	6	2	25	3	2	12	3	4	15
13	8	4	20	3	2	10	3	2	11
14	3	2	25	0	0	10	0	0	7
15	3	2	24	3	2	16	11	4	19
16	0	0	28	0	0	2	0	0	9
17	0	2	24	0	2	12	0	2	16
18	3	4	19	0	2	10	0	4	8
19	8	2	16	0	0	8	3	2	13
20	0	2	23	0	0	5	0	2	7
21	0	4	21	0	2	10	moved from school district		
22	5	2	16	0	0	8	2	0	9
23	3	2	15	0	0	5	0	2	6
24	0	0	18	0	0	6	0	0	8
25	3	2	11	0	0	5	1	0	6
	132	58	648	60	24	390	66	44	298

strators agreed that the program had indeed been effective as a means of improving behavior of students in the treatment group; the administrators also were unanimous in their feeling that the better behavior of the students in the treatment group probably contributed to better overall classroom behavior of the school population in general since those in the treatment group had often previously been responsible for directly or indirectly encouraging their peers to misbehave by their own examples (no data exists, of course, to substantiate this conclusion). The administrators also evaluated the "preventive maintenance" concept through a study of the data obtained in the statistical analyses of the project, through input from the teachers' advisory committee at its meetings, and from interviews with students who participated in the program. All administrators agreed that the program was received well by the faculty, that the results of the statistical analyses revealed an improved atmosphere for learning in the school through the reduction in the need for discipline among the school's twenty-five most chronic offenders, and that the program should be expanded to all grade levels on a year-long basis for 1979-80 (see Conclusions and Recommendations section of this report).

2. Teachers, through the use of a specially designed detention slip which required them to comment on the nature of the offense for which they assigned any student detention time (see Appendix for copy of form and usage explanation), and through the use of a specially designed corporal punishment form which required them

to comment on the nature of the offense for which they administered corporal punishment to any student (see Appendix for copy of form and usage explanation) provided written evaluations of students in the treatment group (as well as for the school population in general). In addition, faculty members both individually and collectively in meetings gave responses of a positive nature about the preventive maintenance program, with a majority of these teachers identifying improved classroom behavior and fewer instances of class disruptions as two of the primary discernible benefits of the program. The enthusiasm of those faculty members most closely associated with the project (those having students in the treatment group) is perhaps best demonstrated by their approach to the project, which was to make constructive suggestions for program improvements and refinements rather than to simply offer negative criticism without accompanying remedies.

3. Students in the treatment group also evaluated the program. All pupils except two indicated that they were glad that they had participated in the program. Nineteen of the students agreed that the program had definitely helped them to improve their behavior during its operational period, and fifteen of these nineteen indicated that they thought their behavior would continue to be improved from the 1977-78 school year even though the program had terminated.

Evaluation of the Practicum

1. A written anecdotal journal was kept by the author of this report containing dates and information about the operational aspects of the "preventive maintenance" program as it related to the specific

needs, objectives, strategies, and evaluations of the project. Journal entries included primarily notes taken in the individual student weekly sessions with the vice-principal; specific problems discussed with each student were noted for each session as well as tentative suggestions which treatment group students were to implement.

2. As part of the evaluation designed especially to assist the vice-principal who operated this project in making any needed changes if the project is carried out again in 1979-80, and to receive further input in the evaluatory aspects of this practicum, this report has been submitted not only to Nova University, but also to the other two administrators in this building, to the school district superintendent, assistant superintendent, and director of pupil personnel and to all teachers in the building; an overview explanation of the original intent of the practicum was also included. Feedback from these sources will provide additional evaluation of the project at a second level and perhaps from a somewhat different perspective.
3. This report has also been disseminated to the South Hills Area School Districts Association (SHASDA), of which the West Jefferson Hills School District (Thomas Jefferson High School) is one of nine participating members. A copy of this report has also been sent to the Pennsylvania Department of Education and to the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) with a hope for publication in its national journal, the NASSP Bulletin.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

During January and February, 1979, at the conclusion of the practicum and after all evaluation procedures had been completed, a study was conducted to determine if the "preventive maintenance" concept should be retained for use in the 1979-80 school year. Specifically, the study looked at all of the evaluative data collected throughout the operational period of the project (the first semester of the 1978-79 school year). The oral and written input data from all building administrators, teachers with direct project involvement (those with students in the treatment group), and treatment group members themselves were reviewed. The principal of Thomas Jefferson High School then had the option of recommending to either terminate the preventive maintenance concept utilization, continue it for 1979-80 as it existed in 1978-79, or expand it to include all grade levels in the school and for the entire school year rather than only one semester.

Conclusions

1. The objective to reduce the total number of suspension days received by the twenty-five members of the treatment group by 54 percent during the practicum's operational period (semester one of 1978-79) when compared with the total number of suspension days received by this same group for semester one of 1977-78 was 92.6% successful since the total number of suspension days was reduced by 50 percent overall. Two of the biggest reasons for this success rate according to administrators, teachers directly involved in the project (those with pupils in the treat-

ment group), and treatment group members themselves were the manner in which the project was thoroughly planned and organized before implementation and the way the program was conducted dur- its operation. Another significant reason for the 50 percent reduction in total suspension days accumulated by pupils in the treatment group was the notion that since suspension is the most severe among the three disciplinary types (detention, corporal punishment, and suspension), the reduced need for overall discipline among treatment group members kept some of these pupils from reaching the point where the most severe disciplinary measure (suspension) had to be imposed.

2. The objective to reduce the total number of instances of corporal punishment received the by the treatment group members during the practicum's operational period (semester one of 1978-79) when compared with the total instances of corporal punishment received by this same group for semester one of 1977-78 was 43 percent successful since the total instances of corporal punishment were reduced by 24.1 percent. The success rate in meeting this objective was not as high as the success rate for meeting the objective relative to suspension, and one of the reasons for this is the very reason given for the high success rate in meeting the suspension objective; that is, students in the treatment group were more likely to reach the middle severity discipline level of corporal punishment than they were to reach most severe level of suspension. Again, good project planning, organization, and implementation were cited as other factors contributing to the 24.1 percent reduction in corporal punishment instances among treatment group members.

3. The final objective of the practicum, to reduce total detention hours received by treatment group members during semester one of 1978-79 when compared with semester one of 1977-78 by 48 percent, was more than 100 percent successful since total hours of detention for pupils in the treatment group decreased by 54 percent from 648 hours during semester one of 1977-78 to 298 hours for semester one of 1978-79. Teachers of treatment group members cite a general, noticeable effort on the part of pupils participating in the project to try, especially in the early phase of the practicum, and especially immediately after the participating student's regular weekly conference session, to avoid behaviors which would result in detention being assigned to them. Students in the treatment group confirmed that they did indeed try to avoid breaking school regulations or conducting themselves in ways which would lead to acquiring detention, thereby supporting their teachers' claims that the pupils in general in the treatment group did seem to be making a genuine effort to comport themselves properly.
4. Based on a comparative study of the dates students in the treatment group committed offenses which resulted in them receiving detention, corporal punishment, or suspension and the dates on which their weekly conferences with the vice-principal were held, it appears that teachers of treatement group pupils were correct in their judgment that misconduct was less likely to occur during the day or days immeidately after the regularly scheduled conference session.

General Recommendations

1. It is recommended that the concept of "preventive maintenance" be

considered as an effective means for reducing the necessity of discipline to be administered to those students who are most frequently in violation of school rules and regulations.

2. It is recommended that the "preventive maintenance" concept be implemented as an alternative or secondary approach to discipline at the high school level, particularly for those students who can be identified as the school's most chronic discipline problems.
3. It is recommended that the "preventive maintenance" concept be retained for use in at least one grade level initially and then gradually expanded to other grade levels as modifications and refinements are incorporated into the program.
4. It is recommended that the "preventive maintenance" concept be implemented on an all-year basis and that data as described in this report be maintained for later analysis and review.
5. It is recommended that when the "preventive maintenance" concept is implemented, the person or persons who meet weekly with those students in the treatment group should be persons generally in charge of maintaining school discipline (such as principals, vice-principals, or assistant principals as opposed to guidance counselors or teachers).
6. Recommendations (in addition to the ones made above) to the principal of Thomas Jefferson High School relative to the "preventive maintenance" concept included the following:

   a. That the "preventive maintenance" concept be retained for use at Thomas Jefferson High School for 1979-80 implementing the recommendations above and herein to improve, through the use of these incorporated refinements, the overall effectiveness of the program.

b. That the "preventive maintenance" approach to discipline be adopted at all grade levels at Thomas Jefferson High School for 1979-80.

c. That the "preventive maintenance" concept be discussed by the high school principal with other school principals within the district (elementary and middle school) at monthly "Superintendent's Meetings" so that those interested in attempting its use are made aware of the program and its operational aspects and results.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ackerly, Robert L., The Reasonable Exercise of Authority, Washington, D.C., The National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1969.

Brothers, W. Richard, "Procedural Due Process: What Is It?," NASSP Bulletin, Reston, Virginia, The National Association of Secondary School Principals, January, 1975

"Corporal Punishment," NEA Research Bulletin, May, 1973.

deZafra, Carlos, Sixty-Two Suggestions To Improve Classroom Discipline, West Orange, New Jersey, The Economics Press, Inc., 1968

Jessup, Michael H., and Kiley, Margaret A., Discipline: Positive Attitudes for Learning, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, 1971.

Luther, John, Discipline, Democracy, and You, West Orange, New Jersey, The Economics Press, Inc., 1968.

Netzer, Lanore A.; Eve, Glen G., Graef, Ardelle; Krey, Robert D.; and, Overman, J. Fred, Interdisciplinary Foundations of Supervision, Boston, Massachusetts, Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1970.

Pennsylvania Commissioner of Education's Task Force on Student Responsibility and Discipline, Guidelines for School Discipline, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania Department of Education, October, 1976

"Spare the Rod and Spoil the Principal," Nation's Schools Report, Volume 5, Number 6, March 12, 1979, p. 1.

Trump, J. Lloyd, A School for Everyone, Reston, Virginia, The National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1977.

Weldy, Gilbert R., Principals: What They Do and Who They Are, Reston, Virginia, The National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1979.

APPENDIX

COPIES OF DETENTION ASSIGNMENT FORM AND CORPORAL PUNISHMENT FORM WITH ACCOMPANYING EXPLANATION OF THE UTILIZATION OF EACH.

DETENTION HALL

Date of Offense _____

I have assigned (student's name) _____ Homeroom # ___ Grade/Sec _____

Amount of detention time _____ Nature of offense (explain): _____

check one: 1. Monday (office-supervised) ___
2. Tues. (teacher-supervised) ___
3. Thurs. (teacher-supervise!) ___

_____

_____

_____
(Teacher signature)

_____(use reverse side if nec.)

The detention slip above is filled out by the teacher assigning detention for each student to whom detention is assigned. The slip is submitted to the vice-principal, who maintains these slips alphabetically in his office. Detention, according to the handbook teachers receive, is appropriate for tardiness and minor kinds of classroom, study hall, or homeroom misbehavior.

The corporal punishment form below is filled out by a teacher on any occasion when he administers corporal punishment to a student and is submitted in duplicate to the vice-principal, who sends one copy to the superintendent and maintains the other in an alphabetical file in his office. Corporal punishment, according to the handbook teachers receive, is to be administered with a regulation paddle with no more than four strokes of the paddle. A witness (professional employee) must be present when corporal punishment is administered. Corporal punishment is appropraite for profanity, smoking, and repeated infractions of school regulations for which detention had been previously assigned but was ineffective.

Date _____

To the Superintendent:

I have administered corporal punishment to _____

for the following offense _____

_____

_____

Person reporting the offense _____

Student Data: Male ___ Female ___

American Indian ___ Black American ___ Asian American ___

Spanish Surname ___ Other ___

The witness to the act of corporal punishment was: _____

(signed) _____

(title) _____

Submit this form in duplicate to the high school office.